HD

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/730,851	12/09/2003	Arnold H. Bramnick	BOC9-2003-0038 (407)	5241

40987   7590   11/14/2007
AKERMAN SENTERFITT
P. O. BOX 3188
WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33402-3188

EXAMINER
ROBINSON BOYCE, AKIBA K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3628	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/14/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action **_Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief_**	10/730,851	BRAMNICK ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Akiba K. Robinson-Boyce	3628	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED _____ FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

    a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

    b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

    Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because

    (a)☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

    (b)☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

    (c)☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

    (d)☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

   NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

    The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

    Claim(s) allowed: _____.

    Claim(s) objected to: _____.

    Claim(s) rejected: _1-11,13-21 and 24-26_.

    Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.

13. ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant argues that the ranking provided in Slivka et al is used to rank passengers, not rebooking flight candidates, and that in the present invention, that flight candidates are presented in a preferred order, where this order is based on a ranking of the flight candidates according to the rebooking rules, and that such a feature is advantageous over the approaches of both Slivka and Gillis, because it allows those flights found to be preferred according to the rebooking roles to be presented at a top of a flight candidate list. However, table 3 of Silvka et al shows a ranking of certain types of passengers. However, this table is used by the rules engine when performing the re-accommodation process as shown in [0026]. Therefore, it is obvious to present flight candidates in a preferred order since when re-accommodating passengers, and say, for example, the passenger is a physically challanged unaccompanied minor, according to table 3, this passenger is # 1 priority, and will be rebooked on a flight 1st, and therefore, this particular flight or flight candidate ill be re-booked in a preferred order. In addition, [0028] discloses that there is adisplay device that allows presentation of notification information so if re-accommodation is necessary. In addition, in claim 14, Silvka et al teaches that flight information for a plurlaity of flights is stored in flight memory, and passenger information, which contain flight iteneraries is stored in passenger database, and both can be used to re-book passengers, therefore suggesting that flight candidates or iteneraries must be used in a particular order to accommodate passengers that are prioritized or ranked according to their profile, or in other words, will re-book passengers on a preferred flight out of a plurality of flights or a flight itenerary. For example, if a particular flight does not have accomodations for physically challenged unaccompanied minors, the next flight out of a plurality of flights, or on the passenger's itenerary is used to accommodate this neccessity. Also, paragraphs [0028] and [0029] show that re-accomodated flights are displayed through a monitor. Since this re-accomodation is based on a plurality of flights or flight iteneraries used in a particular order, Silvka et al therefore suggests that the re-accommodated flights out of a plurality of flights are presented in a particular order.